

REMARKS

Claims 23 to 46 are pending in this application of which claims 23, 31 and 39 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, as shown above, Applicants have corrected the claims to attend to the informalities noted on pages 2 and 3 of the office action. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Turning to the art rejections, claims 23 to 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Bade et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020059054). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater clarity. In view of these clarifications, reconsideration and withdrawal of the art rejection are respectfully requested.

Each of independent claims 23, 31, and 39 has been amended to specify that testing of a simulation model via a graphical user interface(GUI) is performed using a hardware-configuration database interfaced to the simulation model and to the GUI. Claims 23, 31, and 39 have also been amended to make clear that the GUI receives the location of the hardware device from the hardware-configuration database, that the GUI sends commands to the hardware device in the simulation model, and that the GUI accesses the functional-block information of the hardware device located in the simulation model. The functional-block information is affected by the commands sent to the hardware device by the GUI. Bade is not believed to disclose or to suggest these new features of the independent claims, particularly with respect to using a hardware-configuration database interfaced to the simulation model and to the GUI.

In this regard, while Bade's system contains some of the same elements as the Applicants' invention, namely a GUI, a hardware-configuration database, and a simulation model, the interfacing and communication between these elements in Bade are fundamentally different from interfacing and communication of these same elements in the Applicants' invention. Bade neither discloses nor suggests testing a simulation model via a graphical user interface(GUI) using a hardware-configuration database interfaced to the simulation model and to the GUI. In Bade's block diagram of his integrated design environment, shown in FIG. 4A, there is no library or database interfacing the GUI 420 and the processor simulator 432. Though Bade implies that the process simulator 432 contains a library of processor cores in paragraph 86, the library of processor cores 902 shown in Bade FIG. 9 does not interface with the GUI 420. As shown in FIG. 9, the library of processor cores 902 and the IP model library 904 interface with the peripheral editor and simulator module 906 but no other blocks. Bade also describes using dynamically linked libraries (DLL) 438 in paragraph 86. As seen in FIG. 4, the DLL's 438, like the processor library 902 and the IP model library 904, are not interfaced to both the simulator 436 and the GUI 420. Bade thus does not teach testing a simulation model via a graphical user interface (GUI) using a hardware-configuration database interfaced to the simulation model and to the GUI.

Furthermore, Bade never mentions sending a query from a GUI to any library or database, nor does he describe receiving the location of a hardware device at the GUI from a library or a database. In paragraph 86, Bade describes how the GUI model 420 operates on a simulation model 432, "A command input module 424 receives commands from the GUI module

420 and passes them on to a command router module 426, which selects whether the command is routed to a scheduler processor simulator module 432, scheduler module 430, or a simulation engine module 436. A message output module 428 communicates messages from the processor simulator module 432 and the simulation engine module 436 to GUI module 420.” Clearly, the GUI module 420 in Bade does not send a query to a database, nor does the GUI 420 receive a location of a hardware device from a database.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 23, 31, and 39 are believed to be patentable.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claims, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant : Timothy J. Fennell et al.
Serial No. : 10/041,753
Filed : January 7, 2002
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-608001
Intel Ref. No.: P12892

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

While no fees are believed due with this filing, please apply any fees to Deposit Account 06-105, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-608001.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Date: September 13, 2004
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906